



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,297	03/01/2002	Norbert Liebig	HK-605	2763

7590 03/17/2003

LERNER AND GREENBERG, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480

EXAMINER

HENCE, ANDREA A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2854

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicant N .

10/086,297

Applicant(s)

LIEBIG ET AL.

Examiner

Andrea A. Hence

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-2,4,6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Durrnagel (5,566,617).

Referring to claim 1, Applicant disclosed that the prior art teaches an exposure device for exposing thermal printing plates by selectively burning away a surface of a printing plate comprising a plate drum for holding the printing plate; a pressure roller pressing the printing plate onto said plate drum during clamping and unclamping operations of the printing plate.

Referring to claim 1, Durrnagel teaches a pick-up roller (2) in contact with a pressure roller ((1); Column 1, lines 59-60), said pick-up roller picking up residue adhering to said

Art Unit: 2854

pressure roller (Column 2, lines 15-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the prior art Applicant referenced by cleaning the pressure cylinder with a washing roller as taught by Durnnagel.

Referring to claim 2, Durnnagel teaches the pick-up roller (2) is in direct contact with said pressure roller (1). (See Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the prior art Applicant referenced by placing the washing roller in direct contact with the pressure roller allow the washing roller to rotate with the pressure roller to allow for adequate cleaning as taught in Durnnagel.

Referring to claim 4, Durnnagel teaches the pressure roller has a non-adhesive surface (9). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the prior art Applicant referenced to prevent paper from sticking as taught by Durnnagel.

Referring to claim 6, Applicant disclosed that the prior art teaches an exposure device for exposing thermal printing plates by selectively burning away a surface of a printing plate, the exposure device having a plate drum for holding the printing plates and a pressure roller pressing the printing plate onto the plate drum during clamping and unclamping operations of the printing plate.

Referring to claim 6, Durnnagel teaches a pick-up roller (2) in contact with a pressure roller ((1); Column 1, lines 59-60), said pick-up roller picking up residue adhering to said pressure roller (Column 2, lines 15-20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the prior art Applicant referenced by cleaning the pressure cylinder with a washing roller as taught by Durnnagel.

Referring to claim 7, Durrangel teaches the pick-up roller (2) is in direct contact with said pressure roller (1). (See Figure 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the prior art Applicant referenced by placing the washing roller in direct contact with the pressure roller allow the washing roller to rotate with the pressure roller to allow for adequate cleaning as taught in Durrnagel.

4. Claim 3, 5, 8, 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Durrnagel in further view of Corrado et al (6,196,128). The prior art and Durrnagel teach all that is claimed in the above rejections except they do not teach that the pick-up roller has an adhesive surface picking up combustion residue adhering to said pressure roller. Corrado teaches a pick-up roller (18) that has an adhesive surface (Column 5, lines 44-47) for picking up residue adhering to said roller (12). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the prior art Applicant referenced such that the washing roller is an adhesive pick-up roller aid in transferring contaminant particles from a roller to the adhesive cleaning roller as taught in Corrado.

Referring to claim 5, the applied prior art and Durrnagel teach that the pressure roller has a non-adhesive surface. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the prior art Applicant referenced to prevent paper from sticking as taught by Durrnagel.

Referring to claim 8, the applied prior art and Durrnagel teach all that is claimed in the above rejections except it does not teach that the pick-up roller has an adhesive surface picking up combustion residue adhering to said pressure roller. Corrado teaches a pick-up roller (18) that has an adhesive surface (Column 5, lines 44-47) for picking up residue adhering to said roller

Art Unit: 2854

(12). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the prior art Applicant referenced such that the washing roller is an adhesive pick-up roller aid in transferring contaminant particles from a roller to the adhesive cleaning roller as taught in Corrado.

Referring to claim 9, the applied prior art and Durnagel teach that the pressure roller has a non-adhesive surface (9). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the prior art Applicant referenced to prevent paper from sticking as taught by Durnagel.

Referring to claim 10, the applied prior art and Durnagel teach that the pressure roller has a non-adhesive surface (9). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the prior art Applicant referenced to prevent paper from sticking as taught by Durnagel.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea A. Hence whose telephone number is (703) 305-8427. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday; 8:30a-5:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on (703) 305-6619. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2854

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Andrea A. Hence

AAH
March 7, 2003

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Ren Yan".

**REN YAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**